

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion.

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application, although claims 14-18 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 19 are amended. Support for the changes to the claims is self-evident from the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims, and therefore no new matter is added.

In the Office Action the specification is objected to because of an informality. In response, the specification is amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion. It is therefore requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In response, claim 2 is amended to recite "cutting the second adhesive film to form the second series of labels," and claims 6 and 7 are amended to recite "forming the second series of labels." Claim 7 is further amended to recite that "a cutting blade is used to cut the multi-layer structure to form said second series of labels." It is submitted that these amendments to the claims overcome the rejection, and therefore it is requested that the rejection of claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13, 24, 25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Germany Publication No. 2 212 995 (the '995 publication) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,624,520 to Nedblake et al. (Nedblake). Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '995 publication. It is requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed, for at least the following reasons.

The present invention, as recited in independent claim 1, is directed to a process for manufacturing a label stock carrier. Independent claim 1 recites providing a multi-layer structure including a carrier strip covered on its two faces by a first adhesive film and a

second adhesive film. The adhesive films are designed to be cut to form first and second series of labels. During the manufacturing process, the second adhesive film is temporarily separated from the carrier strip during a cutting operation of the first adhesive film on the carrier strip to form the first series of labels.

The claimed invention can provide numerous advantages as a result of cutting the first adhesive film on the carrier strip during separation of the second adhesive film from the carrier strip. By way of specific examples, because the first adhesive film remains on the carrier strip, complete cutting of the first adhesive film can be accomplished. It is submitted that this complete cutting may not occur when a first adhesive film is not cut on a carrier strip, as complete cutting of the first adhesive film would result in the cut portion separating and falling away from the uncut portion. Further, because the second adhesive film is temporarily separated from the carrier strip, the second adhesive film is not present between a cutting blade and a counter-block, for example, which can be used to cut the first adhesive film. Because the multi-layer structure that does not include the second adhesive film is thinner than a multi-layer structure that includes the second adhesive film, the first adhesive film can be cut with a lower risk of cutting into the carrier strip, of incomplete cutting, and of flowage of adhesive.¹

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, the '995 publication is asserted, on page 3 of the Office Action, to show a process for manufacturing a label stock carrier, that includes providing a multilayer structure with a carrier strip 3 covered by first and second adhesive films 2 and 4.

It is noted that the '995 publication is not in the English language. Thus, to the extent that the '995 publication may be used to reject the claims, the drawings may only be used if

¹ Page 2, paragraph [0009] of the originally filed specification.

they *clearly* show the structure being claimed.² In this case, it is submitted that the '995 publication cannot be used in the rejection of the claims, as the publication does not clearly show the claimed features of a multi-layer structure including a carrier strip covered by first and second adhesive films. Specifically, it is not clear that the reference number 3 is analogous to the claimed carrier strip, nor is it clear that the reference number 2 and 4 are analogous to the claimed first and second adhesive films.

Nedblake also does not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of a multi-layer structure including a carrier strip covered by first and second adhesive films, as recited in independent claim 1. Although Figure 6 of Nedblake depicts a carrier sheet 104 and a web 102 including a coating of adhesive on a lower surface 106, Nedblake does not depict or describe a second adhesive film on the carrier sheet 104, for example.

For these reasons, it is submitted that the combination of the '995 publication and Nedblake proposed in the Office Action does not disclose or render obvious the claimed features recited in independent claim 1. It is therefore requested that the rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn, and that the independent claim be allowed.

Independent claim 19 is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. The allowance of independent claim 19 is therefore requested.

Claims 2-13 and 20-28 are allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 19 from which they depend, as well as for their own features. Allowance of these dependent claims is therefore also requested.

Notwithstanding the above discussion, the claims recite additional features that are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the references of record in the application.

² MPEP § 2125.

Specifically, neither the '995 publication nor Nedblake discloses or renders obvious the claimed features of temporarily separating a second adhesive film from a carrier strip during a cutting operation of a first adhesive film on the carrier strip. As discussed above, it is unclear to the extent that the '995 publication may disclose these features recited in independent claim 1. However, the '995 publication does not appear to depict or describe a second film being separated from a carrier strip during cutting of a first film on the carrier strip. Further, Figure 6 of Nedblake depicts that the web 102 is separated from the carrier sheet 104 when the web 102 is cut. Thus, Nedblake is in direct opposition to the claimed features of cutting a first adhesive film on a carrier strip, and therefore suffers from the above discussed disadvantages and cannot provide the advantages provided by the claimed invention.

It is submitted that the above discussion provides further grounds for the allowance of independent claim 1. Independent claim 19 recites features that are similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. It is therefore submitted that independent claim 19 is also allowable for these reasons.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouch
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 32,829

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Philip Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340

I:\ATTY\PH\23s\232688\PROPOSED AMENDMENT.DOC